

face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). “In order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and plaintiff’s response. Plaintiff made no objection to the M&R, and the court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record.

As for the response, plaintiff alleges “Racial Discrimination” and states:

It is overwhelmingly known that the practice of racial discrimination runs tremendously in natural in the southern United States. This is not surprising, it’s worldly [sic] known. It should not be accepted. This is my reason for filing in the United States District Court. The United States District Court is the only court that Black Americans have ever received relief.

North Carolina State Court would not allow me to file anything in the “Perquimans County Court.” That’s discrimination in itself.

This is the area where “Andrew Brown” was executed by the Pasquotank County Sheriffs Department. Andrew Brown’s head was blown off by a military assault rifle where no sheriff was charged for that horrific crime.

I’ve been racially threatened by the defendants each time I drive by my property. I was told by the defendants, if I’m seen riding down Skinner Road something terrible will happen to me.

As for the money that Hood Ellis stold [sic] from me. The North Carolina State Bar Association located in Raleigh North Carolina have received my petition against Hood Ellis. Im awaiting there [sic] response. I’m hoping to be successful in reimbursement of my money.

Pl. Objs. [D.E. 15] 1–2. Plaintiff’s response, however, does not create subject-matter jurisdiction in this court.

In sum, plaintiff's objection to the M&R [D.E. 15] is OVERRULED and the court DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE plaintiff's complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

SO ORDERED. This 23 day of May, 2023.

J. C. Dever
JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge